



Reminiscences of forty years of friendship with Hans Eysenck and collaboration on work on racial and national differences in personality and intelligence

Richard Lynn

University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland BT52 1SA, UK



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 12 October 2015

Accepted 6 April 2016

Keywords:

Race

Personality

Intelligence

Eysenck

ABSTRACT

This paper summarises the author's friendship and collaboration with Hans Eysenck over forty years with particular reference to their work on racial and national differences in personality and intelligence and its subsequent development by the author and others. Eysenck was one of the first to accept a genetically based black–white difference in intelligence. Later work has developed this further by documenting IQs for all races.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

I first encountered Hans Eysenck's work in 1951–3 when I was a student at Cambridge University and read his *Dimensions of Personality* (1947) and *Uses and Abuses of Psychology* (1953). I was very favourably impressed with these, both for the interest of their content and the lucidity of Hans's writing. I much preferred them to the work that was being done at Cambridge that was largely based on information theory and has long since been consigned to the dustbin of history.

I first met Hans in April 1957 when I attended the British Psychological Society annual conference in St Andrews, where I gave a paper on mothers' rearing practises and child socialization (Lynn, 1957). Someone gave a paper arguing that intelligence has no heritability, and Hans responded by giving five reasons why this was wrong. These were the high correlation of the IQs of identical twins brought up in different families, the higher correlation of the IQs of identical twins than of fraternal twins brought up in the same family, the large variability of the IQs of children brought up in orphanages, the positive association of the IQs of these children with the socio-economic status of their fathers, and regression to the mean effects. It was a masterful response. I went up to him afterwards and said how much I liked his intervention. He invited me to join him for lunch and we had an enjoyable conversation. I told him of my poor opinion of psychology at Cambridge and he said he was not surprised.

Later in 1957 Hans published his book *The Dynamics of Anxiety and Hysteria*. In this he integrated his personality trait of introversion–extraversion with Clark Hull's behaviour theory. Many young and middle aged psychologists today have never heard of Hull, but in the 1940s he built a complete theory of behaviour resembling Euclid's geometry,

based on a set of axioms and using hypothetic-deductive logic to deduce theorems that could be experimentally tested. Hull's theory (in its simplest form, because it was quite complex) was an elaboration of Pavlov's theory that behaviour results from the balance of the positive force of excitation and the negative force of inhibition. If excitation is stronger than inhibition, a reaction will be made, and the greater the net excitation, the stronger the reaction will be. In the 1940s and 1950s many regarded Clark Hull as the greatest living psychologist and the journals were full of papers reporting tests of his theories.

In his 1957 book, Hans extended Hull's theory to individual differences. He proposed that extraverts generate reactive inhibition (a particular kind of inhibition) more rapidly than introverts. From this assumption he derived a lot of deductions, for which he provided evidence in his book. One of the most important of these was that introverts would form conditioned Pavlovian anxiety reactions more rapidly than extraverts, and one of his colleagues (Cyril Franks) demonstrated that this was so by using an eye-blink conditioning task in which a sound preceded a puff of air delivered to the eye. After a few trials, the subject becomes conditioned to blink to the sound. On the basis of this theory and result, Hans proposed that children become socialized by developing anticipatory anxiety reactions to disapproval and punishment, and that this process would occur more rapidly in introverts. He elaborated the theory further by proposing that anticipatory anxiety reactions are the basis of conscience and the moral sense, so it followed that introverts should have a stronger conscience and moral sense than extraverts.

I was enthralled by Hans's theory. It embraced Pavlov neurophysiological concepts, Hull's behaviour system, the introversion–extraversion personality dimension, and individual differences in the socialization of children. I began testing some of the deductions that could be made from it. In 1959 I wrote a paper on one of these

E-mail address: lynnr540@aol.com.

and sent it to Hans for his opinion. He replied very warmly and said he would lend me some apparatus if I wanted to do any more work with it. He invited me to London to collect this and stay the night with him and Sybil, which I readily accepted. I had a wonderful evening with the Eysencks. Talking with Hans was a real meeting of minds and unlike anything I had experienced before.

In 1960 I did some more work on Hans's theory. I extended it to the deterioration of performance with age and proposed that this could be explained by an increase in reactive inhibition. Remarkably, it was published in *Nature* (Lynn & Griew, 1960). Later in the year I collaborated with Hans in a study to test his theory that extraverts were more tolerant of pain than introverts. His theory was that they should be more tolerant because they accumulate inhibition more rapidly and this blocks out the pain. I ran the study on students, which involved focusing light through a magnifying glass onto their foreheads. They were instructed to tolerate the pain for as long as they could bear it. This of course burned their skin and for several days they went around with blisters on their foreheads. I do not expect this study would be permitted today but experiments of this kind did not need the approval of ethics committees in those days. We found that there was indeed a significant correlation with extraversion (Lynn & Eysenck, 1961). Several others have confirmed this association, including Barnes (1975) and, more recently, Ferracuti and De Carolis (2005) in Italy.

Later in the 1960s Hans's theory suffered set-backs. The most serious was when Cyril Franks attempted but failed to replicate his finding that introverts condition more rapidly than extraverts. This damaged a major component on the theory that introverts develop a stronger conscience than extraverts because they condition more rapidly. In another set-back, I ran a study in which I gave the introversion–extraversion questionnaire and a questionnaire of moral values to a class of students and found there was no correlation between them. This also undermined Hans's theory. I did not publish this, because I sensed that people do not like to see their theories discredited and I valued Hans's friendship too much to risk alienating him. As a result of these studies, I became disenchanted with his theory and looked for other topics to work on. It was not long before Hans abandoned his 1957 inhibition–excitation theory and reformulated it to propose that introverts have higher levels of arousal than extraverts because of a more neurologically active reticular formation. Despite these problems, I believe that there were elements of truth in Hans's interlocking set of theories. In particular, I think his theory is sound that socialization is acquired by young children by the conditioning of anticipatory anxiety reactions to social disapproval, and hence that young children who do not form these conditioned reactions easily acquire only a weak conscience and frequently develop into psychopaths and criminals. Evidence for the theory was published by Lykken (1995) and more recently by Gao, Raine, Venables, Dawson and Mednick (2010) in a study of children in Mauritius. I think Hans's mistake was to identify extraversion with unsocialized behaviour.

In 1970 I began working on an extension of Hans's personality theory to the measurement of national and racial differences in neuroticism and introversion–extraversion. The approach was to adopt epidemiological and demographic phenomena as expressions of these dimensions. I collected data for the 18 economically developed nations for which there were reliable statistics. The phenomena for which I collected data were rates of suicide, alcoholism and road accident death rates as indices of high neuroticism and rates of chronic psychosis, death from coronary heart disease, and the consumption of caffeine, calories and as indices of low neuroticism. For indices of extraversion I collected data on rates of crime, cigarette consumption, divorce and illegitimacy. Factor analysis showed the two dimensions. The final step was to treat the nations as if they were individuals and use the data to score the nations on the neuroticism and introversion–extraversion factors. The results were that Japan emerged with a high level of the neuroticism together with most of the southern European nations, while the northern Europe nations had low levels of neuroticism. It was impossible to avoid

the conclusion that there are racial differences in neuroticism between Japan and the northern and southern sub-races of Europe. This was my first excursion into the thorny field of national and racial differences (Lynn, 1971, 1982; Lynn & Hampson, 1975). Hans liked this work and together with Sybil began an extensive research programme collecting questionnaire data for nations to examine it further with generally confirmatory results summarised for 25 counties by Barrett and Eysenck (1984) and extended to 37 nations and including Hans's third personality trait of psychoticism by Lynn and Martin (1995).

Although Hans's principal interest was in personality, he wrote quite extensively on intelligence throughout his career. About half of his *Uses and Abuses of Psychology* (1953) was concerned with intelligence. In 1971 he took up the controversial issue of race differences in his book *Race, Intelligence and Education* (Eysenck, 1971). He began by criticising the 1951 UNESCO declaration that “there is no proof that the groups of mankind differ in their innate mental characteristics” and countered that there is equally no proof that they do not differ. He wrote of “the myth of racial equality” and asserted that the evolution of the races in different environments “makes it highly likely that their gene pools differ for some genetically conditioned behavioural characteristics, including intelligence” (p. 20). I have argued that, as in so many of his judgments, Hans was right about this, and that anyone who asserts that the twelve major human races that have occupied very different environments for tens of thousands of years would have ended up with the same gene frequencies for intelligence must be totally ignorant of the basic principles of evolutionary biology (Lynn, 2006). The same conclusion has been advanced by Cochran and Harpending (2009) who provide evidence that humans evolved further and diverged genetically during the last 10,000 years in response to the new challenges presented by different environments, agriculture and civilization.

Most of Hans's book was concerned with the differences in intelligence between blacks and whites in the United States. His conclusions were that the average IQ of blacks was 85 in relation to 100 of whites, that the IQ of blacks was a little lower in the southern states and a little higher in the northern, and that lighter-skinned blacks have higher average IQs than darker-skinned. He was scrupulous in noting that these differences are averages, that there is a wide range of intelligence in all races, and that 11% of blacks in the United States have an IQ higher than the average white. His summary of the evidence on the black–white difference in intelligence in the United States was largely based on the work of Jensen (1969). He went a little further than Jensen who concluded that it was a reasonable hypothesis that genetic factors were involved in the black–white IQ difference, whereas Hans's conclusion (p. 130) was more forcefully put in his verdict that: “All the evidence to date suggests the...overwhelming importance of genetic factors in producing the great variety of intellectual differences which we observe in our culture, and much of the difference observed between certain racial groups.”

Hans also expanded on the work of Jensen by noting the low average IQ of the Australian Aborigines and the higher IQ of mixed race Aborigines and Europeans than of pure Aborigines. This has been subsequently confirmed by further work (Lynn, 2006). He also noted and discussed the low IQ of the Irish in Ireland and suggested that it is likely a result of the emigration of the more able, a conclusion for which I have provided considerable further documentation including the evidence that the IQ of Irish immigrants in the United States is slightly higher than that of British and other northern Europeans (Lynn, 2015).

Hans's *Race, Intelligence and Education* was criticised by Sandra Scarr (1976) who wrote that the book was “generally inflammatory” and that there “is something in this book to insult almost everyone except WASPs and Jews”. It is true that in some places it is written in a way that is likely to offend some people! For instance, he starts off with a recollection of his student boxing days at University College, London, when he was told by ‘Mr Racial Prejudice’ not to punch his black opponent on the chin because ‘these niggers have heads made of iron’. In general, however, I do not think this criticism is justified. While it may be hurtful

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5036268>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5036268>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)